

committee, upholding our commercial marine and maritime power. It is also a bond of peace with foreign nations, constituting a stronger preventive of war than armies or navies, forts or armaments. At present prices, our cotton crop will yield an annual product of \$72,600,000, and the manufactured fabric \$504,000,000, furnishing profits abroad to thousands of capitalists, and wages to hundreds of thousands of the working classes—all of whom would be deeply injured by any disturbance, growing out of a state of war, to the direct and adequate supply to raw material. If our manufactures consume 400,000 bales, it would cost them \$12,000,000, whilst selling the manufactured fabric for \$84,000,000; and they should be the last to quit in imposing heavy taxes upon that interest which supplies them with the raw material out of which they realize such immense profits. Accompanying the drawback of the duty on cotton-bagging should be the repeal of the duty on foreign cotton, which is inoperative and delusive, and not desired by the domestic produce.

The condition of our foreign relations, it is said, should suspend the reduction of the tariff. No American patriot can desire to arrest our onward career in peace and prosperity; but if unhappily, such should be the result, it would create an increased necessity for reducing our present high duties, in order to obtain sufficient revenue to meet increased expenditures. The duties for the quarter, ending 30th September, 1844, yielded \$2,011,885 90 more of revenue than the quarter ending 30th September, 1843—showing a very considerable decline of the revenue, growing out of a diminished importation of the highly-protected articles and progressive substitution of their domestic rivals. Indeed, many of these duties are becoming dead letters, except for prohibition, and if not reduced, will ultimately compel their advocates to resort to direct taxation to support the government. In the event of war, nearly all the high duties would become prohibitory, from the increased risk and cost of importations; and if there be, indeed, in the opinion of any, a serious danger of such an occurrence, it appears most strongly to their patriotism to impose the lowest revenue duties on all articles, as the only means of securing, at such a period, any considerable income from the tariff.

The Secretary here recommends that the rate of duty on luxuries be fixed at the highest revenue standard. He alleges that the protective system does not increase the wages of labor—that the system is to augment the profit of capital, and not the wages of labor—and that the result of the system must be, in a series of years, as the power of manufacturing capital is augmented from time to time, to bring the wages of labor under its control, and ultimately to reduce those wages, so as to increase the profit of capital. The report continues:

Minimums are a fictitious value, assumed by law, instead of the real value; and operation of all minimums may be illustrated by a single example. Thus by the tariff of 1842, a duty of 30 per cent. ad valorem is levied on all manufactures of cotton; but the law further provides that cotton goods "not dyed, colored, printed, or stained, not exceeding in value twenty cents per square yard, shall be valued at twenty cents per square yard." If, then, the real value of the cheapest cotton goods is but four cents a square yard, it is placed by the law at the false value of twenty cents per square yard, and the duty levied on the fictitious value—raising it five times higher on the cheap article consumed by the poor, than upon the fine article purchased by the more wealthy.—Indeed, the House document No. 306, of the 1st session of the 28th Congress, this difference, by actual importation, was 65 per cent. between the cheaper and the finer articles of the 20 per cent. minimum, 131 per cent. on the 30 per cent. minimum, on the 60 per cent. minimum, and 84 per cent. on the 75 per cent. minimum. This difference is founded on actual importation, and shows an average discrimination against the poor on cotton imports of 82 per cent. beyond what the tax would be if assessed upon the actual value. The operation of the specific duty presents a similar discrimination against the poor and in favor of the rich. Thus, upon silk, the duty is not upon the value, but eight cents a bushel, whether the article be coarse or fine—showing, by the same document, from actual importation, a discrimination of 64 per cent. against the cheap, and in favor of the finer article; and this, to a greater or less extent, is the effect of all specific duties. When we consider that \$2,892,921 74 of the revenue last year was collected by minimum duties, and \$13,311,685 46 by specific duties, discrimination against the cheaper article must amount, by estimates founded on the same document, to a tax of \$5,108,422, exacted by minimums and specific duties annually from the poorer classes, by raising thus the duties on the cheaper article above what they would be if the duty were assessed upon the actual value. If direct taxes were made specific, they would be intolerable. Thus, if an annual tax of thirty dollars was assessed on all houses, without respect to their actual value, making the owner of the humble tenement or cabin pay a tax of thirty dollars, and the owner of the costly mansion a tax of but thirty dollars on their respective houses—it would only differ in degree, but not in principle, from the same unvarying specific duty on cheap as on fine articles. If any discrimination should be made, it should be the reverse of the specific duty, and of the minimums principle, by establishing a maximum standard, above which value the duty on the finer articles should be higher, and below which they should be lower on the cheaper article.—The tax upon the actual value is the most

equal, and can only be accomplished by ad-valorem duties. As to fraudulent invoices and undervaluation, these dangers are believed to be arrested effectually by the stringent provisions and severe penalty of the 17th section of the tariff of 1842; and now one-half the revenue is collected from ad-valorem duties.

At least two-thirds of the taxes imposed by the present tariff are paid, not into the treasury, but to the protected classes. The revenue from imports last year exceeded twenty-seven millions of dollars. This, in itself, is a heavy tax; but the whole tax imposed upon the people by the present tariff is not less than eighty-one millions of dollars—of which twenty-seven millions of dollars are paid to the government upon the imports, and forty-four millions to the protected classes, in enhanced prices of similar domestic articles.

In illustration of this position, it is alleged that the duty is not paid by the foreign producer, but by the consumer; and that the duty constitutes as much a part of the price as the cost of production.

The making of laws to increase the profits of particular pursuits is opposed, and the view taken that "legislation for classes is against the doctrine of equal rights, and repugnant to the spirit of the constitution."

The argument of countervailing the effect of foreign tariffs by our own is answered. It is contended that the manufacturers who urge this argument are not the party injured by these tariffs, but the great interests of agriculture, commerce, and navigation; and that, injured as these interests may be by foreign tariffs, they ask no countervailing tariffs at home to decrease the injury. The report says:—"Let our commerce be as free as our political institutions. Let us with revenue duties only, open our ports to all the world, and nation after nation will soon follow our example. If we reduce our tariff, the party opposed to the corn-laws of England would soon prevail, and admit all our agricultural products at all times freely into her ports, in exchange for her exports. And if England would now repeal her duties upon our wheat, flour, Indian corn, and other agricultural products, our own restrictive system would certainly be doomed to overthrow. If the question is asked, Who shall begin this it is answered by the fact, that England has already abated her duties upon most of our exports. She has repealed the duty upon cotton, and greatly reduced the tariff upon her bread-stuffs, provisions, and other articles; and her present bad harvest, accompanied by a reduction of our tariff, would lead to the repeal of her corn laws, and the unrestricted admission, at all times, of our agricultural products."

The report goes on to state that the manufacturing interest is opposed to a reciprocal free trade with foreign nations, and instances the rejection of the Zoll-Verien treaty and their support of a protective tariff, which, it is alleged, is a double benefit to the manufacturer, and a double loss to the farmer and planter—a benefit to the former, in nearly a monopoly to the home market, and in enhanced prices of their fabrics; and a loss to the latter, in a payment of those high prices, and in total or partial exclusion from the foreign market. The report adds: The number of manufacturing capitalists who derive the benefit from the heavy taxes extracted by the tariff from the twenty millions of people, does not exceed ten thousand. The whole number (including the working classes engaged in our manufactures) deriving any benefit from the tariff, does not exceed 400,000, of whom not more than 40,000 would still have been brought into this pursuit by the last tariff. But this small number of 40,000 would still have been in the country, consuming our agricultural products; and in the attempt to secure them as purchasers, so small a number, and not consuming one-half the supply of many countries, the farmer and planter are asked to sacrifice the markets of the world, containing a population of eight hundred millions, disabled from purchasing our products by our high duties on all they would sell in exchange. The farmer and planter would have the home market without a tariff, and they would have the foreign market also to a much greater extent, but for the total or partial prohibition of the last tariff.

The report goes on to speak of the great variety of our agricultural products, which to be consumed must find a foreign market, or be greatly depressed in value. If on our reduction of duties, England repeals her corn laws, nearly all Europe must follow her example, or give to her manufacturers advantages which cannot be successfully encountered in most of the markets of the world. The report adds: The tariff did not raise the price of our bread-stuffs; but a bad harvest in England does—giving us for the time that foreign market which we would soon have at all times, by that repeal of the corn laws which must follow the reduction of our duties. But whilst bread-stuffs rise with a bad harvest in England, cotton almost invariably falls; because the increased sum which, in that event, England must pay for our breadstuffs, we will take, not in manufactures, but only in specie; and, not having it to spare, she brings down, even to a greater extent, the price of our cotton. Hence the result, that a bad harvest in England reduces the aggregate price of our exports, often turns the exchanges against us carrying our specie abroad, and inflicting a serious blow on our prosperity. Foreign nations cannot far a series of years import more than they export; and if we close our markets against their imports by high duties, they must buy less of our exports, or give a lower price, or both.

Prior to the 30th of June, 1842, a credit was given for the payment of duties; since which date, they have been collected in cash. Before the cash duties and

the tariff of 1842, our trade in foreign imports re-exported abroad afforded large and profitable employment to our merchants, and freight to our commercial marine, both for the inward and outward voyage; but, since the last tariff, this trade is being lost to the country. The total amount of foreign imports re-exported, during the three years since the last tariff, both free and dutiable goods, is \$33,384,304—being far less than in any three years (except during the war) since 1793, and less than was re-exported in any one of eight several years. This result is attributed to the combined result of the cash duties and the tariff. If the cash duties are retained, as it is believed they should be, the adoption of the warehousing system is recommended; by which the foreign imports may be kept in store by the government, until they are required for re-exportation abroad, or consumption at home—in which latter contingency, and at the time when for that purpose they are taken out of these stores for consumption, the duties are paid, and, if re-exported, they pay no duty, but only the expense of storage.

The favorable effect of the bill allowing a drawback of our duties on foreign exports carried through our ports to Canada is shown, and an extension of the system recommended, so as to permit the exportation of Canada goods in transit through our own ports to foreign countries.

A reduction and graduation of the price of public lands unsaleable at present rates, in favor of settlers and cultivators, is recommended, as one of the means of increasing the revenue. It is alleged that such reduction of the price in favor of the settlers would increase the wages of labor.

The "constitutional treasury" is earnestly recommended, having no power to make loans or discounts, or issue any paper, and confined to the use exclusively of gold and silver.

In connection with the "treasury of the constitution," the location of a branch of the mint at New York is recommended as a place for keeping safely the vast amount of revenue collected at N. York, and also a means of increasing the coinage, and the circulation of gold and silver.

The coast survey is rapidly progressing—having been extended eastward to the eastern coast of Massachusetts, and southward nearly to the dividing line between Maryland and Virginia, on the Chesapeake. Two new centres of operation have been opened in North Carolina and on the Gulf of Mexico. The importance of the light house system is referred to, and the attention of Congress called to the fact that from the Chesapeake to the Capes of Florida, our coast is badly lighted.

The report concludes by referring to the importance of charts of the exploring expedition, and announcing that a report is in preparation in relation to the banks and currency, and other statistics.

THE TARIFF.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Dec. 11, 1845

To the Hon. ROBERT J. WALKER, Secretary of the Treasury:

Sir: I am assailed in the official of this morning, on account of the remarks I made day before yesterday in debate on the Message and your Report on the Finances.

The article purports to be editorial, but, from the manner in which it speaks of your motives and intentions, I infer that it has emanated from you, and therefore I feel called upon to notice it.

This article affirms that "it never entered into the conception either of the President or Secretary to recommend excise." Now I know not, nor can the official know, what entered into your conception; but I know it is your report, and no language can make it plainer than it is. Here are your own words, as quoted at the time:

"In accordance with these principles, it is believed that the largest practicable portion of the aggregate revenue should be raised by maximum revenue duties upon luxuries whether grown, produced, or manufactured at home or abroad."

Thus the same duty is proposed to be levied on the articles indicated, "whether grown, produced, or manufactured at home or abroad."

In reply, it is said that "a duty is not an excise," and, therefore, the Secretary did not recommend an excise. This is disputing about words; but I take it that a duty levied on manufactures made "abroad" is an impost, and that a duty levied on manufactures made at "home" is an excise. So that a duty may be an excise. But the name—the word excise—it seems is objectionable. You may change the name, but this will not change the thing. The recommendation is to levy a duty on "luxuries, whether grown, produced, or manufactured at home or abroad." No ingenuity can explain this away, and the only escape is to "withdraw or modify it." Yet my calling this "an excise" is pronounced to be an "egregious misrepresentation."—Now, if there be a misrepresentation in the case, I submit who is guilty of it?

As in the case of the 12 1/2 per cent. revenue standard recommended in your circular, which, when exposed, the official said the Secretary had copied "verbatim" from an old circular of 1832, so, in this case, the Secretary may have copied this suggestion from Mr. McDUFFIE's letter, so highly eulogized in the official, in which he recommends the adoption of this very rule to levy the same duties on domestic and foreign goods. This Mr. McDUFFIE, however, says, "is a great concession to the manufacturers; for, in strict justice, he thinks the whole of the duties should be taken off the foreign and put on the American manufacturer."

You did not go this length, but confined it to luxuries.

"Numerous other misstatements" are spoken of. Why are they not pointed out? What are they? Here are my statements—are any of them untrue? I re-affirm them, and challenge contradiction. I said that the Secretary had pronounced the protective policy to be unconstitutional; against the authority of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe and Jackson, who all, over and over again asserted the power and recommended its exercise by Congress for the protection of American manufactures. Is this a misrepresentation?

When the popular voice shall be heard in tones of thunder, denouncing this new and unheard-of doctrine, shall we be then told that this too "never entered into the conception of the President or Secretary?"

I said that the Secretary had denounced the tariff of 1842 as "too unjust and unequal, too exorbitant and oppressive, too clearly in conflict with the fundamental principles of the Constitution." Is this a misrepresentation? I said the Secretary had asserted (I used his own words) that "experience proved that, as a general rule, twenty per cent. ad valorem will yield the largest revenue." Experience proves this, does it, when the fact is notorious that in 1842 (the only time we had any experience of a 20 per cent. ad valorem duty) the revenue was not half what it has since been, and is now under the protective tariff of 1842? Is this an "egregious mistake?" And, if so, who made it? I said that the Message prescribed a ruinous and anti-American rule in relation to revenue, which, if adopted by Congress, would not only check all future investments, but prostrate every branch of mechanical and manufacturing industry wherever manual labor and not labor-saving machinery was extensively employed. Here is the rule in the words of the Message:

"As long as Congress may generally increase the rate of duty on a given article and the revenue is increased by such increase of duty, they are within the revenue standard; when they go beyond that point, and, as they increase the duty, the revenue is diminished or destroyed, the act ceases to have for its object the raising of revenue for the support of Government, but is for protection merely."

In other words, whenever the American mechanic or manufacturer begins to supply the market, and imports and revenue are consequently diminished, the duty ought to be reduced so as to put down the American and let in the foreigner.—This is his rule. Now, I said this was precisely such a rule as Sir ROBERT PEEL would recommend for our adoption; it was a rule that would guaranty the American market to the foreigner forever, or until American labor was ground down and degraded to the half-starved and wretched condition of the serfs and paupers of Europe; and that the American masses, thus deprived of the means of educating their children, would be obliged to work, as in Europe, from the cradle to the grave, and that their moral and political condition would in the end be no better than theirs.

Such most clearly must be the practical and inevitable operation of this rule, if carried out. And are these the benefits and blessings this Administration has in reserve for the "poor man?" I said they were.

Was this a misrepresentation? I submit the question with confidence to the good sense of the American people.

I said that in your report, for the first time in an official form, had promulgated the doctrine of "free trade," which is openly and distinctly avowed; and to enforce the argument, reference is made to the "free trade" existing among the States; and it is declared that "reciprocal free trade among nations would best promote the interests of all;" that "the manufacturing interest opposes reciprocal free trade with foreign nations;" and "if it desired reciprocal free trade with other nations, it would have desired a very different tariff from that of 1842."

These are your positions, and I inferred that you were in favor of "FREE-TRADE."

Was this too an "egregious misrepresentation?" I said that the policy recommended by this Administration, if carried out, would be ruinous to Pennsylvania, because her iron and other manufactures were carried on mostly by MANUAL LABOR, and not, as in New England, by labor saving MACHINERY, and that therefore, to induce the investment of capital and the acquisition of experience, she must be protected against a free competition with the depressed and low priced labor of Europe.

Your report represents the foreign market as all important to the farmer, whilst the home market you consider of small comparative consequence; yet it appears from official documents that our annual exports of agricultural products (deducting cotton, tobacco, and rice) have not for a series of years exceeded an average of ten millions of dollars a year, whilst the domestic market amounts to more than fifty times that sum. Massachusetts, it is ascertained, imports and consumes annually thirty-three millions of dollars worth of agricultural products of the other States, whilst Great Britain, from whence we import about fifty millions of dollars worth of manufactured goods annually, (one half of the whole value of which consists of agricultural produce, raw material, and the substance of labor) does not take of all the agricultural productions of the United States, (excluding cotton, tobacco, and rice,) two and a half millions of dollars worth a year: thus estimating one-half the value of our imports to consist of agricultural produce converted into goods, it follows that we import and consume about twenty-five millions of British agricultural produce in the form of manufactures, whilst she takes less than two and a half from us; so that

we purchase and consume ten dollars worth of British agricultural produce, converted into cloth, iron, and other goods to one dollar's worth of the same articles she takes from us. Yet, according to the report, to the farmer the foreign market is every thing and the home market nothing.

The report says that protective duties are levied exclusively for the benefit of the rich monopolists. At the expense of the farmers and laborers. Now, I contend that just the reverse of this is the truth. That the practical effect of protection is to increase the number of manufacturing establishments, and thus destroy monopoly by promoting competition; and that by withdrawing labor from agriculture to manufactures, you not only diminish the supply, but at the same time increase the demand for agricultural produce, and of course increase its price; whilst, on the other hand, by increasing manufacturing establishments you increase the supply of manufactured goods, and of course reduce their price, so that the farmer is thus enabled to sell for more and buy for less. If demand and supply regulate price, this conclusion is inevitable. Yet the report says "the tariff is a double benefit to the manufacturer and a double loss to the farmer."

The Secretary of State (Mr. BUCHANAN) understood this much better, when he sent a toast some time since to the manufacturers of Pittsburg to this effect. The election of JAMES K. POLK has saved the manufacturers from being ruined and overwhelmed by excessive competition. He was right. It certainly did favor the invested capital, the monopolists, by checking competition, and thereby keeping down the wages of labor and the produce of the farmer, which would, in a different result, have been enhanced in price by an increased demand. This is illustrated by the fact that at Pittsburg, shortly before the tariff of 1842, the laborers in the factories were put on half work, and of course half pay; and almost immediately after its passage they were restored to full work and full pay. It is for the sake of the laborer and the farmer, therefore, that I advocate the protective policy, and not for the "rich monopolists"—the only class that will be benefited by the course of this Administration in the check their policy will give to competition and new investments of capital, while the "poor laborer" and the farmer will be the only sufferers.

I submit to every man of practical common sense whether such must not be the result. And yet we are gravely told by both the Message and Report that protective duties operate exclusively for the benefit of the rich capitalists, at the expense of the "poor laborer and the farmer!"

But, finally, this whole question, so interesting to the American people, turns upon a simple question of fact. "Do protective duties ultimately increase or reduce the price of the articles on which they are levied?"

Now the message and the report assume (but fail to prove in a single instance) that protective duties have increased prices, and are therefore oppressive and burdensome; while, on the other hand, I assert, and am ready to prove by your own documents, by every prices-current and every merchant in the country, that the prices of protected goods have been reduced by competition since the odious minimums and specific duties were first imposed for protection in 1816 to one-half one-third, one-fourth, and in some instances to one-sixth part of what they were at that time, as in the case of coarse cottons, glass, iron, nails, &c.; yet, in the face of these undeniable facts, it is asserted that the duty (nine cents a yard—150 per cent.) is added to the price of the domestic as well as the imported goods, and is paid by the consumer, and that the "poor man," is thus taxed on his coarse cotton goods 82 per cent. more than the rich when the fact is admitted that the poor man now gets a better article made at home, and paid for in labor or produce, at one fourth of the price he paid in 1816, when the minimum duties were first imposed; while, on the other hand, the wages of labor and the produce of the farmer, flour, grain, meat, &c., have underwent little or no reduction of price, owing to the increased demand produced by the increase of manufactures. Such has been the effects of protective duties.—But revenue duties, levied on articles not produced or manufactured at home, may do generally increase prices, because they do not produce competition and increased supply. But to the facts, I call for the proof. Show me the evidence that in a single instance protective duties have permanently increased prices. This you assert and I deny. This is an issue of fact, and not of argument. Produce, then, your evidence that protective duties have permanently increased prices, and then go on and denounce protection as much as you please, as plunder, robbery, and oppression. But first your facts and then make your argument. As a lawyer I ask you, sir, would any court in Christendom tolerate for a moment the course you pursue? You bring a suit against A, who denies your claim; are you at liberty to assume the facts without proof, to be just as you want them, and then make your speech and ask a verdict? Surely not. Yet such is the course pursued on this great question.—You and your friends assume, without proof, that protective duties increase prices, and then contend that the "poor man" and the farmers are oppressed and plundered by the tariff. Now, if this be found to be untrue in point of fact, and that the reverse is true, that they reduce prices and of course lessen burdens, then what becomes of all your arguments and speeches against the oppression of the tariff? They fall lifeless to the ground.

I deny, then, your right to assume your facts, and call on you for the proof. The facts lie at the foundation of the whole question, and I trust they will be furnished. But why thus disturb the tariff of 1842? Has it not replenished your bankrupt Treasury, restored your currency, lifted up the States and the people from utter prostration? Has it not given employment to labor, markets to the farmer, and prosperity to the whole country? And what harm has it done, and why disturb it? In conclusion, I wish it understood that in nothing I have said do I intend to be personally offensive to the Secretary of the Treasury, for whom, from an early acquaintance, I have ever cherished sentiments of personal respect and esteem. But when I see him, or any man, aiming what I conceive to be a mortal blow at the vital interests of my State and my constituents, no personal, no earthly consideration can prevent me from interposing my arm, feeble as it may be, to ward off the blow. A. STEWART.

whole question, and I trust they will be furnished. But why thus disturb the tariff of 1842? Has it not replenished your bankrupt Treasury, restored your currency, lifted up the States and the people from utter prostration? Has it not given employment to labor, markets to the farmer, and prosperity to the whole country? And what harm has it done, and why disturb it?

In conclusion, I wish it understood that in nothing I have said do I intend to be personally offensive to the Secretary of the Treasury, for whom, from an early acquaintance, I have ever cherished sentiments of personal respect and esteem. But when I see him, or any man, aiming what I conceive to be a mortal blow at the vital interests of my State and my constituents, no personal, no earthly consideration can prevent me from interposing my arm, feeble as it may be, to ward off the blow. A. STEWART.

Turnpike Election.

THE Stockholders in the Somerset and Bedford Turnpike road company will take notice that an election will be held at the house of James Phillips, in Allegheny township, on the 1st Monday (5th day) of January next, to elect one President, six Managers, and one Treasurer, to conduct the affairs of said company the ensuing year.

BENJAMIN KIMMEL, President.
nov18 Bedford Inquirer publish 3 times and charge Company.

Cumberland Market.

Flour, per barrel,	\$5 00 a 5 50
Wheat, per bushel,	1 00 a 1 10
Rye, "	55 a 0 60
Corn, "	75 a 0 80
Oats, "	55 a 0 40
Potatoes, "	31 a 0 37
Apples, "	31 a 0 37
" dried "	37 a 0 50
Peaches dried "	1 00 a 1 25
Butter, per pound,	15 a 0 18
Beef, "	3 a 0 4
Veal, "	3 a 0 5
Chickens, per dozen,	1 25 a 1 50
Eggs, "	10 a 0 12
Stone Coal, per bushel,	7 0 8

BANK NOTE LIST.

Pittsburgh, Pa.
CORRECTED WEEKLY

STANDARD—GOLD AND SILVER Pennsylvania.

Pittsburgh Banks,	par
Philadelphia Banks,	par
Girard Bank	par
United States Bank,	30
Bank of Germantown	par
Monongahela Bank Brownsville	1
Bank of Gettysburg	1
Bank of Chester County	par
Bank of Chambersburg	1
Bank of Delaware,	1
Bank of Susquehanna County	—
Bank of Montgomery County	par
Bank of Northumberland	par
Bank of Lewistown	1
Bank of Middleton,	1
Carlisle Bank	1
Columbia Bank and Bridge Co.	pa
Dryestown Bank	par
Erie Bank	1
Franklin Bank, Washington	1
Farmers' Bank Reading	par
Farmers Bank Bucks County	par
Farmers & Drover's Bank Waynesb'g	par
Farmers' Bank Lancaster	par
Lancaster Co. Bank	"
Lancaster Bank	"
Harrisburg Bank	1
Honesdale Bank	"
Lebanon Bank	"
Miners' Bank Pottsville	"
Wyoming Bank	"
Northampton bank	"
York Bank	"
State Scrip, Exchange bank Pitts.,	1
Mer. and Man's B	par
Issued by solvent Banks	1
Ohio.	
Mount Pleasant	1
Staubenville, (F. & M.)	"
St. Clairville	"
Marietta	"
New Lisbon	"
Cincinnati banks,	1
Columbus	1
Circleville	1
Zanesville	1
Putnam	"
Wooster	"
Massillon	"
Sandusky	"
Gauga	"
Norwalk	"
Kenia	"
Cleveland Bank	"
Dayton	"
Franklin Bank of Columbus,	"
Chillicothe	"
Sciota	5
Lancaster	10
Hamilton	15
Granville	45
Commercial Bank of Lake Erie,	14
Farmers Bank of Canton	20
Urbana,	40
Indiana.	
State Bank and branches,	1
State Scrip, \$5's	3
Illinois.	
State Bank	40 Shawnetown
Missouri.	
State bank	1
Tennessee.	
Memphis	3 Other solvent banks
North Carolina.	
All solvent banks	2
South Carolina,	
All solvent banks	2
New England,	
New England	1
New York.	
New York city par Other banks	1
Virginia,	
Eastern solvent banks	1
Wheeling and Branches,	"